

Minutes--Commission on Technology in Learning Meeting  
August 31, 2000

Members Present: Bobby Glaser, Heidi Haugen, Jeff Horton, Don Ingwerson, Maria Molina-Blackman, John Nagata, Richard Navarro, Betty Silva, Diane Siri, Julia Sylva, Moises Torres, and Alice Tsou.

Liaisons Present: Catherine Banker, Carlton Jenkins, David Leveille

CDE Staff Present: Susie Lange, Nancy Sullivan, Karen Steentofte and Brandi Jauregui

The meeting commenced at 10:00 a.m. Susie Lange, Deputy Superintendent for the Finance, Technology and Administration Branch, welcomed everyone and then turned the meeting over to Nancy Sullivan, Manager for the Education Technology Office who introduced the California Department of Education (CDE) staff, which included Kevin Matsuo, Director Technology Services Division, Karen Steentofte, Consultant with the Education Technology Office, and Brandi Jauregui, Analyst with the Education Technology Office. Ms. Sullivan then reviewed the agenda for the two-day meeting and other housekeeping matters.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Eastin addressed the group regarding the history and current status of education technology in California. She stressed the need to provide comprehensive technology programs below the high school level to prepare students both in technology skills and academic skills. Eastin likened the providing of technology to every classroom in 2000 as similar to the task of providing electricity to every home in the 1930's. She noted that every student required technology skills in today's economy, even jobs for coal miners required computer knowledge. Eastin went on to observe that the State has no business requiring particular technology hardware and infrastructure standards for schools since technology changes so fast that requiring certain standards would only be regulating schools into the past. Finally, she asked the Commission to gather public input and thanked them for sharing their time and expertise to develop roadmaps to help school districts do technology planning.

Ms. Eastin next introduced Interim Secretary for Education, John Mockler. Secretary Mockler thanked the Commission members on behalf of the Governor for agreeing to serve on the Commission. Secretary Mockler reiterated the Governor's commitment to narrowing and eventually eliminating the "Digital Divide" where it may exist in our schools. He mentioned the \$175 million dollar hardware project being administered by the Governor's Office of the Secretary for Education. He also urged the Commission to base its recommendations on student achievement and to link the guidelines to the state standards. He suggested that they review the Governor's Commission on Building for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century's education technology recommendations. Finally he stated that the Governor was not interested in a narrow body of regulations or hardware and infrastructure standards for technology. He said that they would like to see benchmarks tied to the money. Benchmarks would provide accountability while allowing the school districts to decide how to accomplish the job.

Curriculum Commission Liaison Banker suggested to Secretary Mockler that funding for the maintenance and operation of technology infrastructure should come from categorical funding. Secretary Mockler acknowledged the technical support issue, and suggested the possible use of the DHS Program as a model, but indicated that he did not feel that categorical funding was the best solution.

Ms. Steentofte briefed the Commissioners on the Commission's role and responsibilities under the law. The Commission is responsible for recommending guidelines to the State Board of Education (SBE) for local technology plans by October 1, 2000, although, due to the fact that the appointment process took so long, the likelihood of making that deadline was slim. Ms. Steentofte also indicated that although the law now says that local education agencies (LEAs) are required to have technology plans by January 1, 2002 to be eligible to receive education technology funding, they are not required to use the recommended guidelines developed by the Commission.

Ms. Lange indicated that CDE staff would request to the SBE that the Commission's deadline be moved to at least December. The Commission would be expected to have the document in draft form by October, and it is expected that the document would be adopted in December.

Ms. Sullivan then went briefly into the open meeting and conflict of interests rules, noting that Michael Hersher from the CDE Legal Office would be briefing the Commission on these issues later in the day. She next explained the various levels of technology services in the State including the four Statewide Education Technology Services (SETS)[the California Learning Resource Network (CLRN) Project, Technology Information Center for Administrative Leadership (TICAL), California Statewide Master Agreements for Resources in Technology (C-SMART), and the Professional Development and Resources for Technical Support Staff Project] and the eleven regional California Technology Assistance Projects (CTAP). Next Ms. Sullivan described the Digital High School (DHS) program and its fairly detailed planning requirements. She explained that the detailed level of planning in the DHS program is required by the DHS law. While many schools complain that it is a lot of work, they are usually thankful when it comes time to implement the program since the process provides them a clear and detailed plan. On the other hand, Federal E-Rate Program, which will be discussed later, has very minimal planning requirements.

Commissioner Navarro inquired whether or not the CLRN materials included professional development materials; Ms. Sullivan answered that, in fact, that CLRN does not provide recommendations on professional development materials. Commissioner Navarro also noted his interest in seeing the DHS reports to the Legislature. Ms. Sullivan said she would make those available to the Commissioners, but that they needed to take into account that it is still too early in the program to determine if there had been any improvement in student achievement.

While eating lunch, each Commissioner, in turn, made brief remarks introducing themselves and sharing some of their priorities in education technology.

Tal Finney of the Governor's Office arrived and Ms. Lange introduced him. Mr. Finney stated that the Governor's office is excited about the Commission's work and that they are in capable hands with the knowledgeable CDE staff. He spoke about using technology as a tool to advance the "academic standards issue." He also encouraged the Commission to work with businesses and the private sector when developing the guidelines. He suggested that every step taken should be with an eye on content. He noted one of the recent accomplishments in the state as being the advent of the Internet 2 backbone in the state. The Governor's Office anticipates statewide connection through the K-20 network soon. He knows that the current funding does not take care of the "last mile" connection to schools and classrooms, but the State should be able to deal with the last mile through the private sector because the advances in technology are bringing down costs.

Mr. Finney concluded his presentation and the Commissioners resumed their introductions and presented some of their preliminary ideas on education technology and local planning.

Ms. Lange then introduced Sonia Hernandez, Deputy Superintendent for the Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Branch of the CDE. Ms. Hernandez presented the state frameworks and noted that academic content standards, assessment and accountability systems are in place. Specifically, the State Board of Education has adopted academic content standards in four areas; Language Arts, Math, Science, and History and Social Science. She urged the Commission to be bold and to envision a future that includes technology for all kids. She encouraged the Commissioners to 1) think about providing access for all; 2) make sure the discussions are tied to other major reform efforts in the state; 3) make sure that there is a focus on professional development; and 4) to think about using technology for students who do not have access to quality instruction.

There was a general discussion about the state assessment process and then Ms. Lange briefly described (at the request of SBE Liaison Jenkins) the California Student Information System (CSIS) Project as a model of a way to create change without disrupting existing systems.

After Ms Hernandez's presentation, Ms. Sullivan introduced Van Wilkinson, Consultant with the Education Technology Office, who explained the Federal E-Rate Program and the criteria the program uses for technology plans. He pointed out that most people do not feel that the five questions that make up the E-Rate planning requirements are sufficient to create a useful and comprehensive local technology plan. The five question that comprise the entire E-Rate planning requirement are as follows:

1. The plan must establish clear goals and a realistic strategy for using telecommunications and information technology to improve education or library services.

2. The plan must have a professional development strategy to ensure that staff knows how to use these new technologies to improve education or library services.
3. The plan must include an assessment of the telecommunication services, hardware, software, and other services that will be needed to improve education or library services.
4. The plan must provide for a sufficient budget to acquire and maintain the hardware and software.
5. The plan must include an evaluation process that enables the school or library to monitor progress.

Ms. Steentofte briefly described the Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8. This program requires a local "action plan" describing how technology professional development will be integrated with the regular ongoing professional development provided to teachers and administrators. Unlike Digital High School, the planning requirements for this program are all complied with locally, with no state criteria or review.

Mr. Hersher, from the CDE Legal Office, covered the requirements of the conflict of interest law and SBE policy and the Bagley-Keene (Open Meeting) Act. He referred them to the written explanations in their packets and stated that he was available to confer with each of them privately on individual matters as they arose.

Ms. Steentofte explained the online ethics training and asked each Commission member to provide the Education Technology Office with a copy of their certificate once they had completed the training. She stated that everyone should try to complete the course prior to the next meeting. Ms. Jauregui then gave a presentation on the travel claim reimbursement process.

Ms. Sullivan handed out the *Discussion Draft for Guidelines on Local Education Technology Planning* and explained the draft had been written by CDE staff as a starting point for the Commissions work. This draft was developed after a search of existing literature on local technology planning and a review of the planning requirements of existing funding programs, specifically the federal E-Rate program. The structure of the draft was geared towards answering the required five E-Rate planning questions, with some modification to better organize the planning decisions at the school district level. Ms. Sullivan asked the Commission members to find time to read the draft that night as most of the next day would be dedicated to discussing the draft.

Ms. Lange opened the floor for public comment.

Martha Diaz, a parent working with the Tower of Youth Organization encouraged outreach to parents and students, and to leave teachers room for creativity in the classroom.

Barbara Starr, CTAP Chair from Region 1, indicated CTAP's support and commitment to the Commission's effort.

John Hodges, a lobbyist for Computer Using Educators (CUE) gave a brief explanation of the organization and stated that he felt the Commission member were receiving a good briefing as preface to their work. He also informed the members that CUE would be having a conference in Sacramento in November and extended an invitation to the Commission to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Minutes  
Commission on Technology in Learning  
September 1, 2000, Sacramento

Members Present: Bobby Glaser, Heidi Haugen, Jeff Horton, Don Ingwerson, Maria Molina-Blackman, John Nagata, Richard Navarro, Betty Silva, Diane Siri, Julia Sylva, Moises Torres, and Alice Tsou.

Liaisons Present: Catherine Banker, David Leveille

Absent: Jenkins (liaison)

CDE Staff Present: Susie Lange, Nancy Sullivan, Karen Steentofte and Brandi Jauregui

The meeting was convened at 8:30 by Susie Lange.

The Commission started by discussing the draft guidelines for technology planning that had been handed out the previous day. Commissioner Ingwerson explained that while he was prepared to discuss the draft, he would also like to review it in more detail and e-mail any additional comments to CDE staff. Everyone agreed that this was a good plan. Individual members of the Commission raised the following issues and offered the following suggestions based on their initial reading of the draft. While the focus of the discussion was local planning, issues pertaining to a state master plan for education technology were also raised.

- ◆ Parent access and participation is very important.
- ◆ A glossary of technology terms would be useful.

- ◆ There should be more outreach to higher education and the private community, including the public library system.
- ◆ Schools need to improve the school libraries as part of their tech plan. As a media center, the library can be made available to students and the community in non-school hours.
- ◆ The document should explain the process California uses for standards and accountability, perhaps in a preface.
- ◆ Examples would be useful.
- ◆ A clear vision seemed to be lacking in the draft. It should be defined and it should be compelling.
- ◆ Commissioner Haugen suggesting incorporating a passage from her school's mission statement, which was subsequently copied and distributed to Commissioners for consideration.
- ◆ Students need to be ready to think in the information age not the industrial age.
- ◆ The Commission should visit model sites for technology to help them define good local planning.
- ◆ A definition of technology should be agreed upon by the Commission and included in the guidelines. Technology is not just computers. The relevant law defines technology as "technology based equipment, materials, and networks." Specifically the definition of technology could include television, video technology, microscopic cameras, computer-based laboratories, and digital cameras.
- ◆ Integrating multiple technologies should be encouraged.
- ◆ A technology needs assessment should be done for each school in the district.
- ◆ Use technology to do pre and post testing as a diagnostic service to prepare for the high school exit exam.
- ◆ Distance learning should be incorporated into the guidelines, including the possibility of schools offering online high school curriculum.
- ◆ The guidelines should be designed to focus on universal design and access which would develop a system to serve all students.
- ◆ Encourage the training of students in network support.

- ◆ Urge publishers to create software and technological materials that support the state standards.

At this point in the discussion, the Commissioners decided to elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson. Commissioner Horton nominated Commissioner Navarro for Chair. Commissioner Siri seconded. Ms. Lange called for the vote. 12 ayes, 0 noes. Commissioner Navarro is elected Chair of the Commission. Commissioner Torres volunteered himself for the position of vice-chair. Commissioner Nagata seconded the nomination. Chair Navarro called for the vote. 12 ayes, 0 noes. Commissioner Torres is elected Vice-Chair. Chair Navarro suggested that perhaps there should be a second vice-chair representing K-12. Commissioner Sylva agreed and nominated Heidi Haugen. Chair Navarro called for the vote. 12 ayes, 0 noes. Heidi Haugen is elected Vice Chair.

- ◆ The Commissioners then resumed their discussion of the draft guidelines. The following issues and suggestions were offered.
- ◆ Incorporate parent/teacher partnerships, and provide technology training for parents.
- ◆ Suggest using technology mentors and having stakeholders and higher education as part of the monitoring process.
- ◆ Incorporate partnerships with higher education and businesses.
- ◆ Suggest making recommendations to increase accessibility to technology by lengthening hours of availability.
- ◆ Suggest making recommendations to continually update professional development activities.
- ◆ Suggest making recommendations to provide for experimentation with new technologies in infrastructure.
- ◆ Suggest making recommendations to increase security measures.
- ◆ Suggested addressing different levels of knowledge and expertise.
- ◆ Utilize e-learning companies for professional development.
- ◆ Conduct a survey of the current technology in schools.
- ◆ Include a focus on long-term and short-term monitoring and evaluation.
- ◆ Give districts some flexibility in the guidelines, and stay away from micro-management.

- ◆ Demonstrate ways that the embedded technology standards will improve student achievement.
- ◆ Include a specific section that addresses access to technology at every educational level.
- ◆ Give the solid feeling of guidance, but not a scripted use of technology.
- ◆ Suggest the use of external evaluators.
- ◆ Encourage high schools to dialogue with their “feeder” schools, and visa versa, when developing their plans.
- ◆ Technology standards should be interwoven into the content standards and build on the existing embedded standards.
- ◆ The Commission needs to be careful not to spend too much time on assessing and monitoring the effectiveness of technology as a tool, when the state already has an accountability plan.
- ◆ Technology should not only be considered as a tool to be blended in with the curriculum, but flexibility should be given for advance exploration into the field of technology.
- ◆ Encourage districts to make specific links to the state standards.

Chair Navarro then introduce Senator Nell Soto, the author of the legislation that created the Commission on Technology in Learning. Senator Soto thanked the Commissioners for taking on this task and offered her support. The Commissioners then took the opportunity to have photos taken with the Senator.

The Commission next broke into subgroups and began discussing different components of the draft technology plan. The group then came back together and each subgroup gave a report of their suggested recommendations.

Commissioner Glaser gave a report for the curriculum subgroup. They suggested that the Commission prepare a new document that would serve as a technology framework, and restate the existing state technology standards and how to use technology as a tool to implement the standards. They also suggested that there be referrals to specific web sites, a checklist that assesses the districts’ current technology, and a follow-up assessment of content integration and student achievement. Curriculum Commission Liaison Banker suggested the use of a CD-ROM that points out examples of integrating technology into the standards. She also suggested that the examples be accessible via the Internet as well.

Commissioner Horton gave the report for the professional development subgroup. They suggested developing a link between the standards and technology that includes the



technology in all of the professional development activities currently being conducted. They suggested that districts plan timelines and allot sufficient resources, explore many different avenues for professional development, and the use of “technology ambassadors”, such as a librarian, who would partner with teachers and instruct them on how to use the technology located in the library.

Commissioner Silva gave the report for the infrastructure subgroup. The group would like to see suggestions for integrating multiple technologies, physical modifications including security, obsolescence, replacement, and repurposing. The group suggested eliminating the word “checklist” and instead using the terms “issues to be addressed” and “what is your proposal of response?” They would like the sites to be thoughtful of the need for technology support for hardware and software and for focusing on student achievement. They also suggested casting a larger net on technological options available to districts and sites.

The Commissioners then discussed the fact that they felt that information data management also needed to be addressed in the guidelines, and that the “business side” and the “teaching side” of education should not be separated, but integrated.

Commissioner Nagata gave the report for the funding subgroup. They suggested that the guidelines use “teacher-friendly” language, give teachers the flexibility to purchase technology and eliminate the bureaucracy, suggest partnerships with businesses, include a provision that districts make a commitment to providing support and maintenance for the site, suggest a budget for security, suggest providing release time for teachers during the workday for staff development, and suggest providing compensation for “technology certification” and training.

Commission Sylva gave the report for the monitoring and evaluation subgroup. The group suggested that the word “checklist” be changed to “priorities” and that schools rely on the correlation of SAT 9 and exit exams to gauge student achievement. They also suggested that the Commission define the evaluation process, establish benchmarks and performance indicators, as well as how to assess teacher technology levels with the use of external evaluators.

Chair Navarro then suggested that the group discuss the format of the document. CPEC Liaison Leveille suggested that a narrative “vision” be put together, Commissioner Siri agreed. Chair Navarro suggested that the two work together to develop the “vision” and they agreed to put together a draft. Commissioner Ingwerson urged the Commission to avoid the “standard” format and instead use a format that will capture the imagination. Commissioner Horton recommended using a sidebar that lists a direct correlation between the state standards and technology and also that the Commission avoid addressing only those students on the higher end of the spectrum of technology knowledge. He also recommended the development of a CD-ROM version that would demonstrate the use of integration.

Chair Navarro then asked the commissioners to review the draft more thoroughly and send their specific comments to CDE staff for compilation. He specifically asked the people who had reported out on a component to send their notes and comments to Nancy. It was then decided that CDE staff would make the suggested revisions to the draft and have another draft ready for the next meeting on October 4, 2000, from 10 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. at a location to be determined. CDE staff was also asked to begin arranging some public meetings at several locations across the State, including Fall CUE and maybe the CSLA and ACSA conferences.

Chair Navarro next asked for any public comment and Karen Jordan with Apple Computer addressed the Commission. After thanking the Commission for its work, Ms Jordan had the following six comments or suggestions for the Commission:

- 1) The ISTE student standards are excellent and might be helpful to school districts as they plan.
- 2) The planning guidelines not have specific directives, but rather leave room for flexibility and focus on student performance
- 3) For a resource on assistive technology look at apple.com site. There is an assistive technology portion.
- 4) Consider School Interoperability Framework (SIF)--Microsoft started it, but other vendors are working together to allow various systems and software work together.
- 5) In developing a vision for the use of technology, suggest that students do short presentations and then ask the teachers what did it take in the classroom to get the students to the point of being able to do the presentation.
- 6) Remember when planning to consider technology through the eyes of the students.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.